

**NEVADA MENTAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES**  
**Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA)**  
**Objective Review Panel**  
**August 29, 2007 – 9:00 a.m.**  
**Nevada State Library & Archives, Room A**  
**100 N. Steward Street, Carson, City, Nevada**

**Present:** Chris Lovass-Nagy (DCFS), Belinda Thompson (Goshen), Kristen Rivas (DCFS), Steve Thaler (CSYC/APGFF), Christine McGill (Healthy Coalition HCC), Shannon Foster (Welfare), Deborah Aquino (BFHS), Cathy McAdoo (PACE), Joann Flanagan (RCIS; arrived at 9:17 a.m.)

**Staff:** Maria D. Canfield, Greg Weyland, Evelyn Barragan, Roger Volker, Kirk Hawkins, Layne Wilhelm, Barbara Caskey, Darla Beers, Rebecca Vernon-Ritter, Sara Baiza

**Also present:** Jennifer Crowe (Bristlecone), Gary Hirschl (Community Counseling Center), Tammra Pearce (Bristlecone), Julia Pearce (Bristlecone), Mary Cranston (Bristlecone), Suzanne Thompson (Bristlecone), Betsy Fedor (SRC), Sandy Finelli (SRC), Dorothy Dexter (Vitality Center Unlimited), Judith Ricketts-Stookey (Vitality Center Unlimited), Richard Klain (Lyon Council), Pam Fox (TriFox), Jackson Buck (to take Minutes)

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Ms. Canfield called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and reviewed locations where meeting notices were posted. The panel introduced themselves. Ms. Canfield announced that Roger Volker was the facilitator for the session. Mr. Volker noted that this was an NRS-sanctioned Open Meeting Law meeting. He commented that it was an important meeting and that the agenda will not be rushed, but he requested that comments be brief and concise.

**II. REVIEW, DISCUSS AND MAKE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF MENTAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION, FOR THE WAIT LIST REDUCTION REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS**

Mr. Volker stated that during the course of the meeting, the proposals received for a Wait List Reduction will be reviewed and that twelve applications have been received. He requested that Layne Wilhelm address the group and review the work that needs to be done at this meeting.

Mr. Wilhelm reported that the Nevada State Legislature took under discussion this year the need to increase treatment services to reduce waiting lists. The state was vastly growing with many individuals, and many of them become afflicted with substance abuse issues. The legislature tasked this group with distributing funds which have been set aside to the RFAs. He reviewed the Waiting List Treatment Priorities and stated that each applicant was asked to submit a brief two paragraphs of their program and these will be presented as they were written followed by the staff's technical review.

**1. Bridge Counseling**

**Requested Amount \$124,246**

Mr. Wilhelm read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Bridge Counseling Associates. They were established as Operation Bridge in 1971 to provide substance abuse and

mental health counseling and are currently certified to provide comprehensive evaluation and outpatient treatment for adolescent and adults. Services are available in Spanish and English by over thirty-five duly credentialed staff. Bridge Counseling Associates has consistently demonstrated the ability to exceed their scope of work for the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency. During the past three years, they have over-utilized the total number of clients served as well as individuals and group counseling units by 300% and 400% respectively. They utilize SAMSA's approved evidence-based practices in their client-driven approach to care and require all staff to participate in training and supervision. The program is located in Las Vegas and proposes to offer comprehensive evaluations and outpatient services to 75 adult clients. The request is for \$124,246. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. McGill asked if their beds are currently completely filled at all times. It was noted that this is an outpatient program and there are no inpatient beds.

Ms. McGill asked if the program was at capacity. Mr. Wilhelm responded that the applicant states that they are currently over-utilized by 300% to 400%.

Ms. Rivas stated that she did not think that the applicant wrote to the priority of the RFA, and therefore it was difficult to answer the questions. Ms. Lovass-Nagy, Ms. McGill and Mr. Thaler agreed.

Ms. McGill commented that she thought it was a good idea but a mismatch.

Mr. Wilhelm reviewed the next step in the process which is for the primary scorers to complete the score sheet that is provided for each of the proposals following the presentation of the application. A recommended funding amount and a score should be entered for each application. If you feel that you are unable to give an applicant a score, please state your reason.

## **2. Bristlecone Family Resources**

**Requested Amount \$129,900**

Ms. Caskey read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Bristlecone Family Resources. She pointed out that each applicant was asked how they would like for their program to be introduced in their narrative introductions. This was the narrative that Bristlecone asked be used. "Bristlecone Family Resources is one of Northern Nevada's oldest addiction treatment agencies providing the full spectrum of services for adult men and women including detoxification, residential, transitional living and outpatient and family counseling services for individuals suffering from drug, alcohol and/or gambling addiction. Bristlecone provides services for the Washoe County Sheriff's Department's Civil Protective Custody Unit, Washoe County's adult and family drug courts, Federal parole and probation, pre-trial services and Federal Bureau of Prisons. Bristlecone provides direct treatment and prevention services through its various programs to more than one thousand two hundred individuals each year providing more than seventeen thousand units of service and interacting with dozens of families each week. Treatment at Bristlecone is family-focused and comprehensive helping clients address all of the issues related to their addiction - relational, financial, medical-social, environmental and employment -just to name a few. Family counseling is a critical component of treatment and ending the cycle of addiction among families and as such is a growing focus of treatment services provided at Bristlecone. Population - the program is located in Reno and proposes to treat 249 adults in and outpatient level of care." The request for services is for \$129,900. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Ms. Caskey.

Ms. Foster commented that there is nothing indicating how or what data will be collected for inclusion in the mandatory quarterly reports.

Ms. Thompson asked if the applicants would have an opportunity to answer any questions that the panel might have prior to scoring on the application. Mr. Volker replied that there are really two processes going on here. This is an open meeting and those things that can be discussed are on the agenda. Secondly, the meeting is under the guidelines of the Purchasing Department's protocols. The protocols require that there be an opportunity for the applicants to speak at the end of the meeting. Staff can also be asked questions during the process.

Mr. Thaler commented that if the funds were available, it would be nice to be able to give all of these programs money, but he now realizes more what SAPTA needs to go through in allocating funds. He felt that some of the costs were a little high, but he liked the way the grant was written and, in his opinion, it is a good program.

Ms. McAdoo agreed that some of the costs seemed high, but overall, in her opinion, the costs were too high for 249 clients. She did notice that they have requested funding for quite a bit of staff and this is not referred to in the narrative. Also, some of the percentages within the grant and the budget were confusing.

Ms. Thompson noted that there were some errors in the calculation of the budget. She did like the tie-in throughout the application regarding the motivational interviewing and how that would be translated in the provision of services. She also liked the exit interviews with clients that were leaving, and the use of the information gathered regarding how the clients viewed their treatment experience for evaluation purposes.

Ms. McGill asked if the application specifically states that it reduces the wait list. Those who scored the application responded that it did.

Ms. Foster agreed that she would like to see the funding go to this applicant but she would also like a stipulation that less of the funds go towards administrative costs and more to provision of services.

Ms. Rivas asked if the panel could make recommendations. Mr. Volker responded that the purpose of the process is to gather input from the panel. Ms. Rivas stated that she would then like to recommend also that more of the funds go towards serving the clients and less go to infrastructure.

Ms. McGill stated that she would like to commend the applicant for including health insurance for their employees.

### **3. Community Counseling Center, Carson City                      Requested Amount \$408,193**

Mr. Wilhelm read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Community Counseling Center. The Community Counseling Center of Carson City began as a community addiction clinic in 1985 with the goal to provide high-quality, outpatient care for those suffering from substance abuse and for their families. Since its founding, the clinic has expanded services to include diagnostic assessments, anger management, individual and group therapy, professional training, employee assistance programs, community education and prevention activities, battered intervention groups, civil protective custody, detoxification service and residential services. They changed their name in 1992 to Community Counseling Center to reflect the broader range of

services available. Detoxification services and civil protective custody services were added in October, 2001. In response to community need, the residential component for seventeen clients was opened in 2002. Drug court services were added in 2003. In keeping with the SAPTA requirements POAS they were scheduled to have the Joint Commission review in November of this year for their national certification. The program is located in Carson City and proposes to treat 120 adult clients in outpatient, residential and detox services. The request is for \$408,193. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. Rivas stated that, in her opinion, it was an overall good application. They stated the specific community relationships that exist and listed local people and agencies. They also gave a good description of their evaluation processes to be used; however, there were some things in the budget that were not allowable and needed to be negotiated. There was no mention of the quarterly reports and if identification of clients on the wait list is in direct correlation to the specific funding. Lastly, the applicant states that they currently don't have any Methadone clients. She asked if the applicant will accept Methadone clients and, if so, she would like to see what the plan is in regards to those specific clients.

Ms. McGill stated that, in her opinion, it was a fairly strong RFA. She liked how they addressed the solutions which were very to the point, but expressed concern as she understood that Community Counseling Center has no wait list.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy agreed that it was a good proposal, but questioned the number of six FTEs for residential expansion counselors to serve the population that they are proposing to serve.

Mr. Thaler stated that, in his opinion, the cost of service was too high and asked if the same service could be provided for less money.

Ms. McGill asked if the panel could have access to additional information regarding whether or not applicants are meeting the scope of work in their current grant. Mr. Wilhelm responded that the information was in the process of being entered into the computer system.

Ms. Foster noted that the applicant states that they don't have contact with the clients that are on the wait list and that it doesn't really give specific information on how they are going to reduce time on the waiting list. Ms. McGill noted that this is a difficult issue because facilities use the wait list differently.

Ms. Rivas asked if meals are an allowable cost. Mr. Wilhelm responded that in this instance yes, because it is a residential program.

#### **4. Community Counseling Center, Las Vegas**

**Requested Amount \$172,895**

Ms. Caskey read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Community Counseling Center. They are dedicated through education, prevention, treatment and advocacy to promoting the healthy functioning of individuals, families and society. They are committed to providing culturally competent, affordable and linguistically-appropriate mental health care in a manner that is both compassionate and professional. They are accredited by the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency at Level III, the highest rating for a public funded agency. CCC is also an official internship site for individuals seeking to become licensed alcohol and drug counselors, social workers and marriage/family therapists. They maintain a strong working relationship with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas providing training and supervision for

many of their students. The program is located in Las Vegas, and proposes to treat 115 adult clients in outpatient and intensive outpatient service levels. The request is for \$172,895. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Ms. Caskey.

Ms. Thompson stated, at times, it was difficult to follow the application because of the format. She noted that she has worked with the program in Las Vegas and the services that are provided are invaluable. They are one of the few providers that work with multiple disciplines within the community.

Mr. Thaler commented that, in his opinion, this was one of the higher-scoring programs and that he agreed with Ms. Thompson's comments, but asked what was a 'retention based salary increase for existing staff to fund a counselor'. Ms. Caskey responded that one of the priorities in the RFA was to use resources more efficiently to maintain a staff level in order to keep their capacity at 100%.

Ms. McAdoo agreed with Ms. Thompson's comment regarding the applicant's partnership efforts, but that she also had a difficult time following the application. She asked for information regarding how the wait list will be reduced and questioned the amount listed for software costs.

Ms. Foster agreed that this was a strong application but wanted more information on how list times wait would be accomplished.

Ms. Aquino questioned the calculation for health insurance costs and stated that the cost for software was too expensive.

Ms. McGill commended the applicant for the goal of treatment on demand.

Ms. Thompson pointed out that this program provides services to many of the residents of Las Vegas who have alternative lifestyles and can't seek treatment in other venues.

Ms. Rivas asked about the number of sites for the program as she was thinking about the cost to link computer services together. It was noted that they have three residential sites and one outpatient site. Ms. Rivas noted that if they are budgeting for equipment to link these sites, the cost was not too high. Ms. Thompson commented that it is stated that the funds are for computer maintenance at a cost of \$500/month for each of the four sites.

Ms. McAdoo questioned the amount for bookkeeping costs.

## **5. Family and Child Treatment of Southern Nevada      Requested Amount \$113,304**

Mr. Wilhelm read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Family and Child Treatment of Southern Nevada. They are a non-profit, United Way agency dedicated to helping children, adults and families overcome and heal from the traumas of abuse, neglect and violence through prevention, education and treatment services. FACT serves as the only non-profit agency in Clark County addressing the counseling and social service needs of sexually-abused children and their families. They recognize the relationship between juvenile justice substance abuse and family and community violence and started its juvenile drug abuse prevention program funded by SAPTA which are located at five different sites in Las Vegas and Henderson. The program has two FACT employees working closely with juvenile probation officers and juvenile substance abusers and their families on a weekly basis to ensure the most effective interventions possible.

More than one hundred juveniles are in this program at any given time, and several hundred are seen throughout the course of a year. The program is located in Las Vegas and proposes to treat 105 adolescents in an outpatient service level. The request is for \$113,304. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. McGill commented that in the application it was stated that they were measured by NHIPPS, but in today's summary it says that they don't use NHIPPS waiting list. It was stated that in reviewing the NHIPPS data, the information for this program was not there.

Ms. Rivas commented that whoever wrote the application did not use the current names of various agencies.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy questioned the amount requested because salaries listed in the RFA were annual rather than for nine months.

Mr. Thaler commented that he agreed with Ms. Rivas. He liked the grant and its language, but some of the terminology was out-of-date.

Ms. McGill noted that page eight was confusing because the wording seems to indicate they only served five people. Mr. Thaler clarified they lost potential clients because they could not provide access for them.

Ms. Foster commented that the unit cost was very high at \$378 for an evaluation and \$340 for a face-to-face. Mr. Volker noted that no funding decisions would be made today.

## **6. Family Counseling Services for Northern Nevada Requested Amount \$68,129**

Ms. Caskey read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Family Counseling Services for Northern Nevada. They are a non-profit counseling agency that offers substance abuse treatment, mental health, marital and sexual abuse treatment. They also offer financial and bankruptcy counseling and a representative payee program. As a 501(3)c, they are governed by a Board of Trustees, and have been nationally accredited through the Council on Accreditation. FCS is a partner agency of the local United Way and a member of the Better Business Bureau. Their mission is to assist individuals and families to meet the opportunities and challenges of a changing world. To meet this mission with the assistance of SAPTA funding, they began providing Level 1 treatment in the 1980's. Since that time, they have grown to offer a Level 2 program at NAMS and offer treatment in both programs for those adults with co-occurring issues. They also offer an adolescent level treatment program and propose to assist the community by providing similar services to the clients of Northern Nevada by offering a program of Level 2 and Level 1 treatment for adolescents and to afford them the comprehensive treatment needed while allowing them to remain within the community. As no current treatment provider in Northern Nevada offers a funded Level 2 program for adolescents, FCS will look to assist the community in decreasing the wait list for Level 3 treatment for adolescent girls with co-occurring issues. The program is located in Reno and proposes to treat 40 adolescents in an outpatient service level. The request is for \$68,129. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Ms. Caskey.

Mr. Thaler noted significant errors in the information section and stated that it was a great program, but expressed concern with the application completion process.

Ms. McGill stated that she was concerned that there was no wait list because it was the whole purpose of the application.

Ms. Thompson stated that it is a good concept, but there were problems with NHIPPS, the quality improvement system and the evaluation activities. There also was no information in Section 5 regarding a waiting list process.

Ms. Foster agreed with Ms. Thompson's comments and questioned if they qualify for the grant since it was for a wait list reduction.

Ms. McAdoo stated that, in her opinion, she could not score this application as it didn't address the RFA.

Ms. Flanagan commented that she believed the program also treated male adults and youth before and that they are not currently certified to treat adolescents, but this grant seems to be speaking specifically to adolescent girls. An application for certification for the provisions of these services has been submitted.

## **7. Las Vegas Indian Center**

**Requested Amount \$69,834**

Mr. Wilhelm read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Las Vegas Indian Center. Services are available to 28,830 individuals or 2% of the total population of Clark County. They also serve other high-risk and/or low-income individuals from any race or ethnic group that meets their individual program requirements. They provide substance abuse outpatient treatment for adults that are referred to the center from other agencies, or walk-ins. They also refer clients to other agencies and community partners to access services that they cannot provide. Their mission is to advocate on behalf of the American Indian people to secure a more promising future while preserving the rich historical legacy of the past. Their mission is accomplished through proactive programming for social and economic self-sufficiency, target outreach to youth and elders, community partnerships that facilitate the delivery of services and cultural events that promote the awareness and respect of indigenous people. The program is located in Las Vegas and proposes to treat fifty adults in an outpatient service level. The request is for \$69,834. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. Rivas commented that, in her opinion, the application was an easy read with good concepts, but questioned the format used because it was not per the RFA requirements. She asked if scoring should be lowered because of this fact.

Ms. McGill stated that her biggest concern was that the application described a need, but there was no documentation of a wait list. It was noted that they do have a strong referral base and that this would affect whether or not there was a wait list.

Ms. Rivas commented that the costs were too high.

Mr. Thaler stated that, in his opinion, the application should have requested more funding and noted that there were some clerical errors in the application. Ms. McAdoo commented that the application would have not gone over the allocated number of pages if they would have used the allowable margins.

**8. Lyon Council on Alcohol and Other Drugs****Requested Amount \$74,358**

Ms. Caskey read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Lyon Council on Alcohol and Other Drugs. They have been providing affordable and effective substance abuse treatment for the residents of Lyon and Storey Counties since 1973. They are currently certified by SAPTA to provide Level 1 outpatient services for both adults and adolescents, and currently manage offices in Yerington, Dayton, Silver Springs, Fernley and Virginia City. They have been committed to increasing access to services in Fernley, and for the last two years, have been financing a full-time position by using money in the agency's money market account. Their Yerington office now maintains a wait list with thirteen people seeking treatment. It is hoped that they can continue to maintain its staffing levels in Fernley and eliminate the wait list in Yerington. The program is located in Fernley and Yerington and proposes to treat 67 adolescents and adults in outpatient services. The request is for \$74,358. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were read by Ms. Caskey.

Ms. Thompson commended the application and recommended more funding be requested.

Ms. McAdoo agreed with Ms. Thompson's comments, but noted that the applicable salary for the benefits didn't match the salary page. Ms. Aquino noted an annual salary was presented.

Mr. Thaler agreed with Ms. Thompson's comments, but stated that, in his opinion, more funding should have been requested. Ms. Rivas agreed that more funding should be requested. Ms. Foster agreed that the application was well-written and recommended full funding be approved.

Ms. Flanagan stated bilingual services were needed.

Ms. McGill expressed her approval of the application.

**9. The Ridge House Inc.****Requested Amount \$88,225**

Mr. Wilhelm read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Ridge House, Inc. They serve the criminal justice population through prevention, intervention, rehabilitation services thereby assisting our community in the fight against crime. The Ridge House operates four, licensed and accredited alcohol and drug residential facilities for men and women. The organization also operates a 21-slot outpatient drug and alcohol treatment and a 10-bed transitional housing component. The 2005 Chamber of Commerce of Washoe County recognized the Ridge House as the outstanding, not-for-profit organization of that year and at the National level, Ridge House has been repeatedly recognized by the Justice Department as the model program for reentry and is presently involved in a 3-year study by the Urban Institute. The program is located in Reno and proposes to treat 100 criminal justice adult clients in an outpatient service level. The request is for \$88,225. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were read by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy stated that, in her opinion, it was a reasonable budget and a solid application.

Ms. Rivas agreed with Ms. Lovass-Nagy's comments, but stated she rated the application low because it doesn't completely match the criteria.

Ms. Thompson commended the program for continuing treatment after the patient leaves the facility and that individuals utilize the service.



Ms. Rivas stated she did not agree that serving the extended population should be considered a weakness.

At this time, the Committee took a break. They reconvened at 11:30 a.m.

#### **10. Sierra Recovery Center**

**Requested Amount \$129,323**

Ms. Caskey read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for the Sierra Recovery Center. It has served the Lake Tahoe and Northern Nevada communities since 1970. They offer continuing and compassionate recovery to individuals and families affected by addictive behavior. Sierra Recovery Center is accredited by SAPTA and numerous levels of service which encompass a full continuum of care and is one of the few SAPTA detox programs serving Northern Nevada. The agency's wait list for funded services increases annually. The wait list RFA will provide an opportunity for SRC to fully utilize all available bed space thereby reducing the wait list. Additional interim services provided through the wait list RFA will place a safety net under clients that are prepared to enter treatment, but unable to access it because of lack of available space. The program is located in South Lake Tahoe and proposes to treat 90 adults and outpatient residential detoxification and transitional housing services. The request is for \$129,323. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were read by Ms. Caskey.

Ms. Thompson commended the fact that residential clients are reassessed every 14 days and that the unique need in interim services was acknowledged.

Mr. Thaler asked if there were no other California programs. It was clarified Sierra Recovery Center provide services to Nevada clients.

Ms. Aquino asked if lowering the percentage of Nevada residents was a priority. It was stated what is listed within their application is what the panel should consider.

Ms. Foster stated that, in her opinion, the application was well written, but expressed her concerns with the lack of detoxification services on-site and informing clients of their services.

Ms. Thompson commended the fact that budget items matched.

Ms. Aquino asked how percentages were justified. It was clarified comments will be submitted for further review.

Ms. McGill asked if there were enough personnel to increase services and if they addressed current needs. Ms. Thompson stated that, in her opinion, they did.

Ms. Flanagan stressed the importance of connecting with unique ethnic groups.

#### **11. Vitality Unlimited**

**Requested Amount \$358,571**

Mr. Wilhelm read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Vitality Unlimited. Their mission is to help society improve the health and welfare of mankind by reducing the number of individuals dependent on alcohol and other drugs and establish and foster linkages, services, and programs that improve the quality of life. They were granted a corporate name change to Vitality Unlimited because of the variety of other services in addition to substance abuse treatment it offers. Utilization and need have fueled Vitality Center's expansion to include services in Elko and other Nevada counties governed by voluntary elected Board of Directors

representing the community at large. They have grown from a small, outpatient clinic to a diverse community service organization. They have never had any material error in any of its annual audits and now work off satellite operations and cooperative service providers blanket the entire state. They can successfully deliver to the scope of worth pre- and post-treatment that will provide optimum health care and successful recovery skills for the program for recovery and beyond. The locations were listed. They propose to treat 27 adolescents and 244 adult clients in outpatient residential detoxification and transitional housing service levels in addition to offering pre-treatment in locations outside of Elko. The request is for \$358, 571. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy commended the proposal, but expressed concern with the 12-month budget.

Ms. Rivas commended the description of working relationships, but stated a weakness is generalizing the relationships.

Mr. Thaler stated, in his opinion, the budget was too high considering the number of individuals they service.

Ms. Rivas didn't see a description of a reduction of no-shows.

Ms. McGill commented there was not a lot of collaboration.

## **12. West Care Nevada Inc.**

**Requested Amount \$228,126**

Ms. Caskey read the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for West Care Nevada Inc. It is a 501(3)c non-profit organization founded in 1973 to provide community-based substance abuse treatment for people who are indigent or from low-income households and who would not otherwise have access to treatment services. They currently serve Clark and Nye Counties in five separate facilities. In the fall, services will expand to Washoe County with the opening of a community triage center. They provide a wide spectrum of health and human services in both residential and outpatient environments. Services include: substance abuse and addiction treatment, homeless and runaway shelters, access to medical care, mental health treatment including integrated treatment for coexisting disorders and all residential programs, academic programming for adolescents and adults as well as vocational training and assistance to assess other community-based service agencies. These services are available to adults, children, adolescents, and families. Their mission is to empower everyone with whom they come in contact to engage in a process of healing, growth, and change benefiting themselves, their families, co-workers, and communities. The program is located in Las Vegas and proposes to serve 15 adult and 6 adolescent clients in a residential setting. The request is for \$228,126. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Ms. Caskey.

Mr. Thaler expressed concern about funding for 21 clients. Ms. Foster stated it was \$90 a day for adults and \$110 a day for adolescents.

Ms. McGill stated that, in her opinion, the application fit the proposal.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy expressed concern that funding is being duplicated.

Ms. Rivas asked if additional beds were included in the application. Ms. McAdoo reported there is an additional 8-10 beds in the funding.

A comment was made expressing concern that the operating cost does not match the justification costs.

Ms. Foster reported bed capacity will be increased for women from 14 to 19.

Ms. Aquino stated that, in her opinion, the rent was too high.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy stated that, in her opinion, some charges were too high.

Ms. Thompson requested a review of administrative funding.

Ms. Lovass-Nagy requested to know if tracking is monitored. A review of the monitoring process was provided.

Ms. Rivas recommended only considering funding for seven additional beds.

At 12:05 p.m., the Committee took a lunch break. They reconvened at 12:53 p.m.

Mr. Wilhelm reviewed scoring and reported funding was over by \$27,466. Mr. Volker reported no funding decisions will be discussed today, but recommendations are requested.

Mr. Thaler questioned if additional funding is being unduly allocated to agencies.

Mr. Volker requested to know if an agreement could be made dropping the two agencies with the lowest rating to zero. He called a consensus to recreate their charts.

Ms. Rivas asked if a recommendation could be made to fund the two programs that did not request enough funding. Mr. Volker confirmed recommendations were not limited.

Mr. Thaler requested to know if more funding could be allocated. Ms. Canfield replied she did not think so, but that a recommendation could be made to suspend all funding.

Ms. Thompson asked for a review and distribution of funding after calculating the leftover funding. Discussion followed regarding how leftover funding would be allocated.

Ms. Thompson requested full funding for Sierra Recovery Center and that the top three agencies with the highest rating should receive full funding. Ms. McGill concurred.

Ms. Rivas suggested allocating an additional \$1,000 to the eight programs. Mr. Thaler agreed.

Ms. Thompson expressed concern with allocating additional funding for agencies with low scoring.

Mr. Volker called a consensus to allocate leftover funding between the three top rated agencies.

### **III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

A. Tammra Pearce extended her appreciation to the staff and attendees.

B. Richard Klain expressed his appreciation towards the process.

C. Gary Hirschl extended his thanks for the process and stated it was very helpful.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

**Belinda Thompson moved to adjourn the meeting. Christine McGill seconded the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.**